

**APPENDIX C**  
**VISUAL RESOURCE ANALYSIS**

**Desert Stateline Solar Farm Project EIS: Visual Resources<sup>1</sup> – Summary of Impacts to Key Observation Points**

Viewpoint		Photographic Simulation	Visual Contrast Analysis (see contrast rating worksheets)		Impact Significance <sup>2</sup>	
KOP	Description		Level of Change	VRM Consistency	Proposed Mitigation	Additional Mitigation
3	Two miles from Primm on Interstate 15	yes	Low (All alternatives). The panels would appear as a dark horizontal band located at slightly more than one mile from the KOP, and would be somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape. The panels appear to be approximately the same elevation as the surrounding landscape as seen from KOP 3 because of a relatively low profile (5 feet above ground surface), and because the supporting infrastructure is hidden from view by the terrain or 6-foot fencing treated or painted to reduce visual impacts. The form, line and color contrasts of the panel arrays would be low because of the dark color and the low profile of the panels.	The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The low level of change from all alternatives would meet the VRM Class III objective, which provides for a moderate level of change to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.	not significant	none
5	Interstate 15 overpass on Yates Well Road. View is to the west-northwest.	yes	Low (Alt B and Hybrid). The solar array would be 2.3 miles northwest, and difficult to discern from the surrounding landscape because form, line and color contrasts would be diffused by the distance.  Moderate (Alt D). The facility would appear as a dark horizontal band located at slightly more than 0.5 mile from the KOP that is somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape in terms of color, but visible primarily because of the larger scale of the south array as seen from the KOP	The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The low to moderate level of change from all alternatives would meet the VRM Class III objective, which provides for a moderate level of change to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.	not significant	none
6	NW Primm Valley Golf Club. High point within the golf course. View is to the northwest and north.	yes	Moderate (All alternatives). The panels would appear as a dark horizontal band located at slightly more than 0.8 mile north of the KOP, and would have low color contrasts with the surrounding landscape. The low color contrasts reduce and mute the straight edge line and large-scale, geometric form contrasts. Contrasts would be moderate because of the large scale of the array, which is in close proximity to the KOP and extends across a broad horizontal extent of the field of view.	The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape.  <u>Alternative B and the Hybrid would meet the VRM Class III objective, which provides for a moderate level of change to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.</u>	<u>Alt B and Hybrid - not significant</u>  <u>Alt D - significant</u>	<u>Alt B and Hybrid - none</u>  <u>Alt D - Additional mitigation would not reduce or eliminate</u>

**Desert Stateline Solar Farm Project EIS: Visual Resources<sup>1</sup> – Summary of Impacts to Key Observation Points**

Viewpoint		Photographic Simulation	Visual Contrast Analysis (see contrast rating worksheets)		Impact Significance <sup>2</sup>	
KOP	Description		Level of Change	VRM Consistency	Proposed Mitigation	Additional Mitigation
				<i>Alternative D would dominate the view because of the large scale (horizontal extent) due to the close proximity. The high level of change would not meet the VRM Class III objectives.</i>		<i>impacts</i>
7	SW Primm Valley Golf Club. View is to the northwest, west and southwest	yes	<p>Moderate (Alt B and Hybrid). To the north to northwest, the solar array would appear as a horizontal band located more than 1.5 mile north of the KOP. The facility would be visible, but would repeat dominant horizontal lines of the valley landscape; and form and color contrasts would be diffused by the distance.</p> <p>High (Alt D). The south array would be within 0.10 miles of KOP 7. The supporting infrastructure (tall, narrow, straight edge distribution line poles, and the shielded night-lighting) would be visible due to the close proximity of the array. The overall level of change would be high because of the large scale and close proximity of the array.</p>	<p>The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The moderate level of change from Alternative B and the Hybrid would meet the VRM Class III objective, which provides for a moderate level of change to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.</p> <p>Alternative D would dominate the view because of the large scale (horizontal extent) due to the close proximity. The high level of change would not meet the VRM Class III objectives.</p>	<p>Alt B and Hybrid - not significant</p> <p>Alt D - significant</p>	<p>Alt B and Hybrid - none</p> <p>Alt D - Additional mitigation would not reduce or eliminate impacts</p>
9	Nipton Road overpass on Interstate 15 nearly 10 miles south of Primm, Nevada. View is to the north-northwest	yes	Low (All alternatives). The KOP is about 6.7 miles south of the solar array. The panels would appear as a distant, dark and muted horizontal band that is somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape because of long distances between KOP and north array (6.7 miles) and south array (4.0 miles, Alt D only). The scale is small relative to surrounding landforms.	The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The low level of change from all alternatives would meet the VRM Class III objective, which provides for a moderate level of change to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.	not significant	none
10	Colosseum	yes	Low (All alternatives). The form, line and color	The dark color of the PV modules	not	none

**Desert Stateline Solar Farm Project EIS: Visual Resources<sup>1</sup> – Summary of Impacts to Key Observation Points**

Viewpoint		Photographic Simulation	Visual Contrast Analysis (see contrast rating worksheets)		Impact Significance <sup>2</sup>	
KOP	Description		Level of Change	VRM Consistency	Proposed Mitigation	Additional Mitigation
	Road in Mojave National Preserve. View is to the east and northeast		contrasts of the panel arrays would be low; primarily because the distance of 5 miles diffuses contrasts into the surrounding landscape, and the scale of the facility is small relative to surrounding landforms.	recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The low level of change from all alternatives would meet the VRM Class III objective, which provides for a moderate level of change to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.	significant	
12	2.8 miles west of Primm on transmission line access road. View is to the south.	yes	Moderate (All alternatives). The north array would be within 0.40 miles of KOP 12. The panels would appear as a horizontal band extending across a wide field of view. The overall level of change would be moderate, because the large scale of the array to the viewpoint would be lessened by the muted dark colors, which recede into the landscape; the low profile; and because the dominant horizontal lines and form of the facility repeats the horizontal lines of the valley as seen from the KOP.	The dark color of the panels recede into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The facility would be obvious, but would not dominate the view. The moderate level of change from all alternatives would meet the VRM Class III objective, which provides for a moderate level of change to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.	not significant	none

1 – The Scenic Quality, Viewer Sensitivity, and VRM Class descriptions are the same for all KOPs, and are described in Section 3.18.1 Affected Environment.

2 - The impact is considered significant if it does not meet the designated BLM VRM objective.

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date: 4/18/12

District/ Field Office: California Desert District/  
Needles FO

Resource Area:

Activity (program): Renewable Energy Resources

## SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name Stateline Solar Farm	4. Location Township__17N__	5. Location Sketch
Key Observation Point #3 – 2 miles from Primm on Interstate 15	Range__15E__	
VRM Class VRI Class III	Section__19__	

## SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

1. LAND/WATER		2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Flat, horizontal (foreground); Jagged, complex (background)	Low, irregular, sparse along roadway; Indistinct in background.	Flat, horizontal roadway; Tall, vertical, internally complex lattice of T-line structures; short, vertical, narrow fence posts. ISEGS: tall, vertical towers, horizontal, large scale arrays.
LINE	Long, horizontal (foreground); straight, horizontal butt edge against base of mountains; Jagged, diagonal silhouette of background mountains, diagonal banding of strata	Weak, discontinuous	straight road band; T-line structures vertical, perpendicular to ground, straight and diagonal lattice; straight, vertical, simple posts. ISEGS: narrow, vertical towers; straight edge of arrays
COLOR	light gray-tan to gold-tan (foreground); light to dark tans, grays, browns in mountain background.	Muted gray-greens, dark to medium greens, tan, brown.	Gray road surface; muted, dark gray t-line lattice; brown fence posts. ISEGS: red/white color banded towers; light, shiny panels
TEXTURE	smooth (foreground): coarse, varied (background)	fine, sparse in foreground; fine, medium dense in background.	smooth road band; regular, ordered T-line and fence posts. ISEGS; fine panel surface; regular, orderly towers

## SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

1. LAND/WATER		2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Land modifications not visible	modifications to vegetation not visible	horizontal, flat, rectangular planes of panels in middleground. Large scale in horizontal plane, low profile
LINE	not visible	not visible	straight edge contrasts with surrounding vegetation
COLOR	not visible	not visible	dark, muted tones of PV panels recede into landscape: shiny, gray surface may present intermittent brief contrasts
TEXTURE	not visible	not visible	fine surface

SECTION D. CONTRAST RATING    ☐ SHORT TERM    ☐ LONG TERM

1.  DEGREE OF CONTRAST		FEATURES												2. Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No (Explain on reverse side)
		LAND/WATER BODY (1)				VEGETATION (2)				STRUCTURES (3)				
		STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	
ELEMENTS	FORM		X				X					X		3. Additional mitigating measures recommended <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No    (Explain on reverse side)  Evaluator's Names Date Lisa Welch 2/18/12
	LINE			X				X				X		
	COLOR			X				X				X		
	TEXTURE			X				X				X		

SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

*KOP Description*

KOP 3 provides a view to the west and southwest from Interstate 15 about 2 miles south of Primm, Nevada (the KOP is in California). The highway is in the immediate foreground. The Clark Mountain Range provides a rugged backdrop to the foreground/middleground views of the dry Ivanpah Lake bed and the flat Primm Valley. The Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System is currently under construction to the west and southwest of the KOP; the visual simulations depict the completed Ivanpah project.

*Evaluation Factors*

*Distance: Relatively close (about 1 mile)*

*Angle of View: Project and KOP on same elevation, making project difficult to see.*

*Duration: Short duration view from moving vehicle.*

*Relative Scale: Small compared to surrounding landscape and mountains.*

*Season: Same number of viewers year-round.*

*Light Conditions: Temporary (1/2 hour) glare during low angle sun conditions*

*Recovery Time: Long-term due to slow recovery time for desert vegetation.*

*Spatial Relationship: Low position against mountains and remainder of the viewscape.*

*Atmospheric Condition: Does not affect views.*

*Motion: Not applicable – no moving features in the landscape.*

*Alternative-Specific Contrast Evaluation*

Alternative B: The reflected sunlight (PV panels absorb most sunlight) from the panels as they face the KOP would appear as a lighter, silver-gray color that would have a moderate contrast with adjacent darker soils and vegetation for a maximum of ½ hour in the morning during summer months. The panels would appear as a dark horizontal band located at slightly more than one mile from the KOP that is somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape.

The PV panels appear to be approximately the same elevation as the surrounding landscape as seen from KOP 3. This is because of a relatively low profile (5 feet above ground surface), and because the supporting infrastructure is hidden from view by the terrain or 6-foot fencing treated or painted to reduce visual impacts. Supporting infrastructure such as roads and the Gen-Tie line are visible, but

---

small in scale relative to existing landscape features.

The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the rectangular form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The contrasts of the panel arrays would be low because of the large scale of the array, which is about 1.4 miles west of the KOP, would be subordinate to the overall scale of the landscape. Alternative B would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Alternative D: The impacts and the degree of contrast under Alternative D would appear very similar to Alternative B, with the exception that the horizontal extent of the panels is longer than Alternative B, and interrupted by a break between two separated arrays.

Hybrid: The impacts and the degree of contrast under the Hybrid Alternative would appear very similar to Alternative B; the horizontal band would appear wider. The degree of contrast is slightly larger in extent; but otherwise very similar.

Cumulative: the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, currently under construction in the Primm Valley, consists of three solar arrays of mirrored panels; each array includes a central power tower. The height of the solar panel, the bright, light-colored mirrored panel surfaces, and the tall height of the power towers topped with the bright white panel present strong contrasts of form line and color in the Primm Valley as seen from the KOP. The proposed Stateline project under any alternative contributes a relatively small, incremental impact to the valley landscape when considered cumulatively with the Ivanpah project.

---

#### Additional Mitigating Measures (See item 3)

There is no mitigation additional to the proposed mitigation included in Section 4.18.

---

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date: 4/18/12

District/ Field Office: California Desert District/  
Needles FO

Resource Area:

Activity (program): Renewable Energy Resources

## SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name Stateline Solar Farm	4. Location Township__16N__	5. Location Sketch
Key Observation Point #5 – I-15 overpass on Yates Well Road	Range__14E__	
VRM Class VRI Class III	Section__1__	

## SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

1. LAND/WATER		2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Flat, horizontal (foreground); Jagged, complex (background)	Low, irregular, sparse along roadway; Indistinct in background. Clumps at golf course.	Flat, horizontal roadways; vertical, geometric overpass railing; vertical, narrow streetlights; blocky, small-scale structures at golf course. ISEGS: tall, vertical towers, horizontal, large scale arrays.
LINE	Lon, horizontal (foreground); straight, horizontal butt edge against base of mountains; Jagged, diagonal silhouette of background mountains, diagonal banding of strata	Weak, discontinuous	straight road bands; straight, vertical posts perpendicular to ground. ISEGS: narrow, vertical towers; straight edge of arrays
COLOR	light gray-tan to gold-tan (foreground); light to dark tans, grays, browns in mountain background.	Muted gray-greens, dark to medium greens, tan, brown. Vivid greens at golf course.	Gray road surface; muted, dark gray light posts. Light tans & whites at golf course. ISEGS: red/white color banded towers; light, shiny panels
TEXTURE	smooth (foreground): coarse, varied (background)	fine, sparse in foreground; fine, medium dense in background. Densest at golf course.	smooth road band; regular, ordered T-line and fence posts. Sparse golf course structures. ISEGS; fine panel surface; regular, orderly towers

## SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

1. LAND/WATER		2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Land modifications not visible	modifications to vegetation not visible	horizontal, flat, rectangular planes of panels in middleground. Large scale in horizontal plane, low profile
LINE	not visible	not visible	straight edge contrasts with surrounding vegetation
COLOR	not visible	not visible	dark, muted tones of PV panels recede into landscape: shiny, gray surface may present intermittent brief contrasts
TEXTURE	not visible	not visible	fine surface



## SECTION D. CONTRAST RATING    \_\_SHORT TERM    \_\_LONG TERM

1.  DEGREE OF CONTRAST		FEATURES												2. Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_Yes    __No (Explain on reverse side)
		LAND/WATER BODY (1)				VEGETATION (2)				STRUCTURES (3)				
		STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	
ELEMENTS	FORM		X				X					X		3. Additional mitigating measures recommended __Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_No    (Explain on reverse side)  Evaluator's Names Date Lisa Welch 2/18/12
	LINE		X				X					X		
	COLOR		X				X					X		
	TEXTURE			X				X					X	

## SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

KOP Description

KOP-5 is on I-15 overpass at Yates Well Road. View is to the west-northwest, and includes the overpass road, a frontage road, the non-native trees and landscaping of the Primm Valley Golf Club, and the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System. Valley. The Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System is currently under construction to the west and southwest of the KOP; the visual simulations depict the completed Ivanpah project.

Evaluation Factors

Distance: Relatively close (about 1 mile) in Alts. B and Hybrid, very close in Alt. D.

Angle of View: Project and KOP on same elevation, making project difficult to see.

Duration: Short duration view from moving vehicle.

Relative Scale: Small compared to surrounding landscape and mountains.

Season: Same number of viewers year-round.

Light Conditions: Does not affect views

Recovery Time: Long-term due to slow recovery time for desert vegetation.

Spatial Relationship: Low position against mountains and remainder of the viewscape.

Atmospheric Condition: Does not affect views.

Motion: Not applicable – no moving features in the landscape.

Alternative-Specific Contrast Evaluation

Alternative B: The solar array would be located about 2.3 miles northwest of KOP 5, and would be very difficult to discern from the surrounding landscape because form, line and color contrasts would be diffused by the distance. The rectangular form and horizontal lines of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The overall level of change would be low as seen from the KOP primarily because of the muted dark tones and low profile of the panels, and the scale of the facilities would be subordinate to the landscape. Alternative B would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Alternative D: The alternative includes two arrays. The north array would appear very similar to Alternative B. The south array is in close proximity to the KOP. The reflected sunlight (PV panels absorb most sunlight) from the south array panels as they face the KOP would appear as a silvery-gray color that would have a moderate contrast with adjacent darker soils and vegetation for a maximum of

---

½ hour in the morning during summer months. The panels would appear as a dark horizontal band located at slightly more than 0.5 mile from the KOP that is somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape.

The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape; however, the contrasts of the panel arrays would be moderate because of the large scale of the south array, which is in close proximity to the KOP and extends across a broad horizontal extent of the field of view. Supporting infrastructure such as roads and the Gen-Tie line are visible, but small in scale relative to existing landscape features.

The overall level of change would be moderate as seen from the KOP primarily because of the large scale of the south array as seen from KOP 5. Alternative D would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Hybrid: The impacts and the degree of contrast under the Hybrid Alternative would appear identical to Alternative B.

Cumulative: the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, currently under construction in the Primm Valley, consists of three solar arrays of mirrored panels; each array includes a central power tower. The height of the solar panel, the bright, light-colored mirrored panel surfaces, and the tall height of the power towers topped with the bright white panel present strong contrasts of form line and color in the Primm Valley as seen from the KOP. The proposed Stateline project under any alternative contributes a relatively small, incremental impact to the valley landscape when considered cumulatively with the Ivanpah project.

---

#### Additional Mitigating Measures (See item 3)

There is no mitigation additional to the proposed mitigation included in Section 4.18.

---

---

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date: 4/18/12

District/ Field Office: California Desert District/  
Needles FO

Resource Area:

Activity (program): Renewable Energy Resources

## SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name Stateline Solar Farm	4. Location Township__17N__	5. Location Sketch
Key Observation Point #6 – NW Primm Valley Golf Club	Range__14E__	
VRM Class VRI Class III	Section__36__	

## SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Flat, horizontal (foreground); Jagged, complex (background)	Tall, columnar non-native palm trees and geometric greens at golf course; Indistinct, low shrubs in background.	Flat, horizontal path; Tall, vertical, internally complex lattice of T-line structures; blocky, structures at golf course. Flat, vertical plane of fence. ISEGS: tall, vertical towers, horizontal, large scale arrays.
LINE	Lon, horizontal (foreground); straight, horizontal butt edge against base of mountains; Jagged, diagonal silhouette of background mountains, diagonal banding of strata	Distinct edge of greens; vertical, irregular palms; otherwise, weak, discontinuous	straight road bands; straight, vertical posts perpendicular to ground. ISEGS: narrow, vertical towers; straight edge of arrays
COLOR	light gray-tan to gold-tan (foreground); light to dark tans, grays, browns in mountain background.	Muted gray-greens, dark to medium greens, tan, brown. Vivid greens at golf course.	Gray road surface; muted, dark gray light posts. Light tans & whites at golf course. Tan, light tones - distant structures, ISEGS: red/white color banded towers; light, shiny panels
TEXTURE	smooth (foreground): coarse, varied (background)	fine, sparse in foreground; fine, medium dense in background. Varied and patchy at golf course.	smooth path band; regular, ordered T-line and fence. Sparse structures. ISEGS; fine panel surface; regular, orderly towers

## SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Land modifications not visible	modifications to vegetation not visible	horizontal, flat, rectangular planes of panels in middleground. Large scale in horizontal plane, low profile
LINE	not visible	not visible	straight edge contrasts with surrounding vegetation
COLOR	not visible	not visible	dark, muted tones of PV panels recede into landscape: shiny, gray surface may present intermittent brief contrasts
TEXTURE	not visible	not visible	fine surface

SECTION D. CONTRAST RATING    \_\_SHORT TERM    \_\_LONG TERM

1.  DEGREE OF CONTRAST		FEATURES												2. Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_Yes    ___No (Explain on reverse side)
		LAND/WATER BODY (1)				VEGETATION (2)				STRUCTURES (3)				
		STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	
ELEMENTS	FORM		X				X					X		3. Additional mitigating measures recommended ___Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_No    (Explain on reverse side)
	LINE		X				X					X		
	COLOR		X				X					X		
	TEXTURE			X				X				X		
														Evaluator's Names Date Lisa Welch 2/18/12

SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

KOP-Specific Description

KOP 6 is located on a high point within the golf course. Views towards the proposed project from much of the golf course would be screened by a berm along the course perimeter. View is to the northwest and north, and includes the golf course greens and landscaping, and winding paved path, sparse golf course structures. Beyond the golf course, the lattice towers of a transmission line extend from the foreground to the background; the town of Primm is visible in the background to the north. The rugged Clark Mountain Range provides a backdrop to KOP views. The Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System is currently under construction to the west and southwest of the KOP; the visual simulations depict the completed Ivanpah project.

Evaluation Factors

Distance: Relatively close (about 1 mile)

Angle of View: Project and KOP on same elevation, making project difficult to see.

Duration: Viewer would be stationary on golf course, but would likely only see view for short duration.

Relative Scale: Small compared to surrounding landscape and mountains.

Season: Probably more viewers in spring, summer, and fall, and fewer in winter.

Light Conditions: Does not affect views

Recovery Time: Long-term due to slow recovery time for desert vegetation.

Spatial Relationship: Low position against mountains and remainder of the viewscape.

Atmospheric Condition: Does not affect views.

Motion: Not applicable – no moving features in the landscape.

Alternative-Specific Contrast Evaluation

Alternative B: The reflected sunlight (PV panels absorb most sunlight) from the panels as they face the KOP would appear as a light, silvery-gray color that would have a moderate to strong contrast with adjacent darker soils and vegetation for an estimated ½ hour during morning hours. The panels would appear as a dark horizontal band located at slightly more than 0.8 mile north of the KOP, and would have low color contrasts with the surrounding landscape. The low color contrasts reduce and mute the straight edge line and large-scale, geometric form contrasts.

The PV panels appear to be approximately the same elevation as the surrounding landscape as seen from KOP 6. This is because of a relatively low profile (5 feet above ground surface), and because the supporting infrastructure is hidden from view by the terrain or 6-

---

foot fencing treated or painted to reduce visual impacts. Supporting infrastructure such as roads and the Gen-Tie line either are not visible, or appear to very similar adjacent existing structures.

The dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape; however, the contrasts of the panel arrays would be moderate because of the large scale of the array, which is about 0.8 miles from the KOP and extends across a broad horizontal extent of the field of view. Alternative B would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Alternative D: The north Alt. D solar array would be very similar in appearance as seen from KOP 6 as described for Alternative B; the smaller footprint would not change the appearance because of the view angle. The south array would be about 0.73 miles southwest of the KOP. The additive effect of the south array would increase the visibility of Alternative D to a substantially greater degree than Alternative B. Alternative D would have the largest impact of the three alternatives, because the north and south arrays would be visible from the KOP. Alternative D would not meet VRI Class III Objectives.

Hybrid: The impacts and the degree of contrast under the Hybrid Alternative would appear identical to Alternative B.

Cumulative: the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, currently under construction in the Primm Valley, consists of three solar arrays of mirrored panels; each array includes a central power tower. The height of the solar panel, the bright, light-colored mirrored panel surfaces, and the tall height of the power towers topped with the bright white panel present strong contrasts of form line and color in the Primm Valley as seen from the KOP. The proposed Stateline project under any alternative contributes a relatively small, incremental impact to the valley landscape when considered cumulatively with the Ivanpah project.

---

#### Additional Mitigating Measures (See item 3)

There is no mitigation additional to the proposed mitigation included in Section 4.18.

---

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date: 4/18/12

District/ Field Office: California Desert District/  
Needles FO

Resource Area:

Activity (program): Renewable Energy Resources

## SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name Stateline Solar Farm	4. Location Township__17N__	5. Location Sketch
Key Observation Point #7 – SW Primm Valley Golf Club	Range__14E__	
VRM Class VRI Class III	Section__36__	

## SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Flat, horizontal (foreground); Jagged, complex (background)	Tall, columnar non-native palm trees and geometric greens at golf course; Indistinct, low shrubs in background.	Flat, horizontal path; Tall, vertical, internally complex lattice of T-line structures; blocky, structures at golf course. Flat, vertical plane of fence. ISEGS: tall, vertical towers, horizontal, large scale arrays.
LINE	Long, horizontal (foreground); straight, horizontal butt edge against base of mountains; Jagged, diagonal silhouette of background mountains, diagonal banding of strata	Distinct edge of greens; vertical, irregular palms; otherwise, weak, discontinuous	straight road bands; straight, vertical posts perpendicular to ground. ISEGS: narrow, vertical towers; straight edge of arrays
COLOR	light gray-tan to gold-tan (foreground); light to dark tans, grays, browns in mountain background.	Muted gray-greens, dark to medium greens, tan, brown. Vivid greens at golf course.	Gray road surface; muted, dark gray light posts. Light tans & whites at golf course. ISEGS: red/white color banded towers; light, shiny panels.
TEXTURE	smooth (foreground): coarse, varied (background)	fine, sparse in foreground; fine, medium dense in background. Varied and patchy at golf course.	smooth path band; regular, ordered T-line and fence. ISEGS; fine panel surface; regular, orderly towers

## SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Land modifications not visible	modifications to vegetation not visible	horizontal, flat, rectangular planes of panels in middleground. Large scale in horizontal plane, low profile.
LINE	not visible	not visible	straight edge contrasts with surrounding vegetation
COLOR	not visible	not visible	dark, muted tones of PV panels recede into landscape: shiny, gray surface may present intermittent brief contrasts.
TEXTURE	not visible	not visible	fine surface.

## SECTION D. CONTRAST RATING    \_\_SHORT TERM    \_\_LONG TERM

1.  DEGREE OF CONTRAST		FEATURES												2. Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _Yes    ___No (Explain on reverse side)
		LAND/WATER BODY (1)				VEGETATION (2)				STRUCTURES (3)				
		STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	
ELEMENTS	FORM		X				X					X		3. Additional mitigating measures recommended ___Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _No    (Explain on reverse side)
	LINE			X				X				X		
	COLOR			X				X				X		
	TEXTURE			X				X				X		
SECTION D. (Continued)														Evaluator's Names                      Date Lisa Welch                                2/18/12

Comments from item 2.

KOP Description

KOP 7 is located in the southwest corner of Primm Golf Course. View is to the west, and includes the golf course ditch at the course perimeter, a fence, and the gently rising alluvial fan to the west of the course. The Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System is currently under construction to the northwest, west and southwest of the KOP; the visual simulations depict the completed Ivanpah project.

Evaluation Factors

Distance: Relatively close (about 1 mile) in Alts. B and Hybrid, very close in Alt. D.

Angle of View: Project and KOP on same elevation, making project difficult to see.

Duration: Viewer would be stationary on golf course, but would likely only see view for short duration.

Relative Scale: Small compared to surrounding landscape and mountains.

Season: Probably more viewers in spring, summer, and fall, and fewer in winter.

Light Conditions: Does not affect views

Recovery Time: Long-term due to slow recovery time for desert vegetation.

Spatial Relationship: Low position against mountains and remainder of the viewscape.

Atmospheric Condition: Does not affect views.

Motion: Not applicable – no moving features in the landscape.

Alternative-Specific Contrast Evaluation

Alternative B: The solar array is not visible in southwest views from the KOP, as shown in the simulation for Alternative B, KOP 7; however, in views to the north to northwest, the solar array would appear as a horizontal band extending across a 1.5 mile distance located at slightly more than 1.5 mile north of the KOP. The facility would be visible, but the dark color of the PV modules recedes into the landscape, and the rectangular form and horizontal line of the arrays repeat the horizontal planes and lines of the valley landscape. The contrasts of the panel arrays would also be low because of the large scale of the north array would be subordinate to the overall scale of the landscape. Alternative B would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Alternative D: The south array would be within 0.10 miles of KOP 7. The reflected sunlight (PV panels absorb most sunlight) from the panels as they face the KOP would appear as a light, silvery-gray color that would contrast with adjacent darker soils and vegetation for a very brief period in the morning. The supporting infrastructure (tall, narrow, straight edge distribution line poles, and

---

the shielded night-lighting) would be visible due to the close proximity of the array. The facility would dominate the view, and the overall level of change would be high because of the large scale and close proximity of the array to the KOP. Alternative D would not meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The impacts to viewers at the golf course are substantially larger under Alternative D than under Alternative B or the Hybrid alternative. Alternative D would not meet VRM Class III Objectives.

Hybrid: The impacts and the degree of contrast under the Hybrid Alternative would appear identical to Alternative B.

Cumulative: the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, currently under construction in the Primm Valley, consists of three solar arrays of mirrored panels; each array includes a central power tower. The large arrays of solar panels, the bright, light-colored mirrored panel surfaces, and the tall height of the power towers topped with the bright white panel present strong contrasts of form line and color in the Primm Valley; however, the scale and color contrasts of the Ivanpah project would be minimized by the angle of view and the intervening Stateline project as seen from the KOP. The proposed Stateline project under any alternative contributes a noticeable, incremental impact to the valley landscape when considered cumulatively with the Ivanpah project.

---

#### Additional Mitigating Measures (See item 3)

There is no mitigation additional to the proposed mitigation included in Section 4.18.

---



UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date: 4/18/12

District/ Field Office: California Desert District/  
Needles FO

Resource Area:

Activity (program): Renewable Energy Resources

## SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name Stateline Solar Farm	4. Location Township__16N__	5. Location Sketch
Key Observation Point #9 – Nipton Road overpass on Interstate 15	Range__14E__	
VRM Class VRI Class III	Section__35__	

## SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Flat, horizontal (foreground); Jagged, complex (background)	Low, irregular, sparse along roadway; Indistinct in background.	Flat, horizontal roadway; utility and light poles - varying heights; small, geometric highway structures. ISEGS: tall, vertical towers, horizontal, large scale arrays.
LINE	Lon, horizontal (foreground); straight, horizontal butt edge against base of mountains; Jagged, diagonal silhouette of background mountains, diagonal banding of strata	Weak, discontinuous	straight to curved road band; Poles vertical, perpendicular to ground, straight. ISEGS: narrow, vertical towers; straight edge of arrays
COLOR	light gray-tan to gold-tan (foreground); light to dark tans, grays, browns in mountain background.	Muted gray-greens, dark to medium greens, tan, brown.	Gray road surfaces; muted, dark gray to brown posts. ISEGS: red/white color banded towers; light, shiny panels
TEXTURE	smooth (foreground); coarse, varied (background)	fine, sparse in foreground; fine, medium dense in background.	smooth road band; sparse, ordered T posts. ISEGS; fine panel surface; regular, orderly towers

## SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Land modifications not visible	modifications to vegetation not visible	horizontal, flat, rectangular planes of panels in background. Large scale in horizontal plane, low profile
LINE	not visible	not visible	straight edge contrasts with surrounding vegetation
COLOR	not visible	not visible	dark, muted tones of PV panels recede into landscape
TEXTURE	not visible	not visible	fine surface

SECTION D. CONTRAST RATING    \_\_SHORT TERM    \_\_LONG TERM

1.  DEGREE OF CONTRAST		FEATURES												2. Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_Yes    ____No (Explain on reverse side)
		LAND/WATER BODY (1)				VEGETATION (2)				STRUCTURES (3)				
		STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	
ELEMENTS	FORM			X				X				X		3. Additional mitigating measures recommended ____Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_No    (Explain on reverse side)
	LINE			X				X				X		
	COLOR			X				X				X		
	TEXTURE			X				X				X		
														Evaluator's Names Date Lisa Welch 2/18/12

SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

KOP Description

KOP 9 provides a view to the north-northwest from the Nipton Road overpass at Interstate 15 nearly 10 miles south of Primm, Nevada (the KOP is in California). The highway and Nipton Road on the overpass are in the immediate foreground. The Clark Mountain Range provides a rugged backdrop to the foreground to background views of the flat Ivanpah Valley. The Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System is currently under construction to the west and southwest of the KOP; the visual simulations depict the completed Ivanpah project.

Evaluation Factors

Distance: Relatively far (several miles)

Angle of View: Project and KOP on same elevation, making project difficult to see.

Duration: Short duration view from moving vehicle.

Relative Scale: Small compared to surrounding landscape and mountains.

Season: Same number of viewers year-round.

Light Conditions: Does not affect views

Recovery Time: Long-term due to slow recovery time for desert vegetation.

Spatial Relationship: Low position against mountains and remainder of the viewscape.

Atmospheric Condition: Does not affect views.

Motion: Not applicable – no moving features in the landscape.

Alternative-Specific Contrast Evaluation

Alternative B: The KOP is about 6.7 miles south of the solar array. The panels would not face KOP 9. The panels would appear as a distant, dark and muted horizontal band that is somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape.

The form, line and color contrasts of the panel arrays would be low; primarily because the distance of more than 6 miles diffuses contrasts into the surrounding landscape, and the scale of the facility is small relative to surrounding landforms. The overall level of change would be low as seen from the KOP. Alternative B would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

---

Alternative D: The impacts from the north array are identical to the impacts described for Alternative B. The south array is about 4 miles north of KOP 9. The impacts and the degree of contrast from the south array would be very similar to the north array. There would be a slightly great level of contrast under Alternative D than from Alternative B primarily because both arrays are visible, increasing the overall scale of the project. The panels would appear distant, dark and muted horizontal bands that are somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape. Alternative D would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Hybrid: The impacts and the degree of contrast under the Hybrid Alternative would appear identical to Alternative B.

Cumulative: the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, currently under construction in the Primm Valley, consists of three solar arrays of mirrored panels; each array includes a central power tower. The height of the solar panel, the bright, light-colored mirrored panel surfaces, and the tall height of the power towers topped with the bright white panel present strong contrasts of form line and color in the Primm Valley as seen from the KOP. The proposed Stateline project under any alternative contributes a small, incremental impact to the valley landscape when considered cumulatively with the Ivanpah project.

---

#### Additional Mitigating Measures (See item 3)

There is no mitigation additional to the proposed mitigation included in Section 4.18.

---

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date: 4/18/12

District/ Field Office: California Desert District/  
Needles FO

Resource Area:

Activity (program): Renewable Energy Resources

## SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name Stateline Solar Farm	4. Location Township__17N__	5. Location Sketch
Key Observation Point #10 – Colosseum Road in Mojave National Preserve	Range__13E__	
VRM Class VRI Class III	Section__24__	

## SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	rolling to moderately sloped, trapezoid (foreground); flat to rolling (middleground); steep, jagged (background)	Low, irregular, sparse; Indistinct in background.	Flat, horizontal, narrow roadway. ISEGS: tall, vertical towers, horizontal, large scale arrays.
LINE	moderate to steep diagonal; Jagged silhouette of background mountains,	Weak, discontinuous	straight to road band. ISEGS: narrow, vertical towers; straight edge of arrays
COLOR	light gray-tan to gold-tan (foreground); light to dark tans, grays, browns in mountain background.	Muted gray-greens, dark to medium greens, tan, brown.	tan road surface. ISEGS: red/white color banded towers; light, shiny panels
TEXTURE	smooth (foreground): coarse, varied (background)	fine, sparse in foreground; fine, medium dense in background.	smooth road band. ISEGS; fine panel surface; regular, orderly towers

## SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Land modifications not visible	modifications to vegetation not visible	horizontal, flat, rectangular planes of panels in background. Large scale in horizontal plane, low profile
LINE	not visible	not visible	straight edge contrasts with surrounding vegetation
COLOR	not visible	not visible	dark, muted tones of PV panels recede into landscape: shiny, gray surface may present intermittent brief contrasts
TEXTURE	not visible	not visible	fine surface

SECTION D. CONTRAST RATING    \_\_SHORT TERM    \_\_LONG TERM

1.  DEGREE OF CONTRAST		FEATURES												2. Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_Yes    ____No (Explain on reverse side)
		LAND/WATER BODY (1)				VEGETATION (2)				STRUCTURES (3)				
		STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	
ELEMENTS	FORM			X				X				X		3. Additional mitigating measures recommended ____Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_No    (Explain on reverse side)
	LINE			X				X				X		
	COLOR			X				X				X		
	TEXTURE			X				X				X		
														Evaluator's Names Date Lisa Welch 2/18/12

SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

*KOP Description*

KOP 10 provides a view to the east and northeast from Coliseum Road in Mojave National Preserve. The KOP overlooks part of Primm Valley and Ivanpah Lake. Hills at the base of the Clark Mountain Range frame the view of the valley. The Lucy Gray Mountains are in background views. The Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System is currently under construction to the west and southwest of the KOP; the visual simulations depict the completed Ivanpah project.

*Evaluation Factors*

*Distance: Relatively far (several miles)*

*Angle of View: Elevated above project, as compared to other KOPs.*

*Duration: Viewer would be a hiker who would likely get a long-duration view.*

*Relative Scale: Small compared to surrounding landscape and mountains.*

*Season: Probably more viewers in spring, summer, and fall, and fewer in winter.*

*Light Conditions: Does not affect views*

*Recovery Time: Long-term due to slow recovery time for desert vegetation.*

*Spatial Relationship: View in Alt. D covers a wider field of view than other alternatives.*

*Atmospheric Condition: Does not affect views.*

*Motion: Not applicable – no moving features in the landscape.*

*Alternative-Specific Contrast Evaluation*

Alternative B: The KOP is about 5 miles west-southwest of the solar array. The reflected sunlight (PV panels absorb most sunlight) from the panels as they face the KOP would appear as a silvery-gray color with a moderate to strong contrast with adjacent darker soils and vegetation for a very brief interval of time in the late afternoon. The panels would appear as a dark horizontal band that is somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape.

The form, line and color contrasts of the panel arrays would be low; primarily because the distance of 5 miles diffuses contrasts into the surrounding landscape, and the scale of the facility is small relative to surrounding landforms. The overall level of change for all facilities would be low as seen from the KOP. Alternative B would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

---

Alternative D: The impacts from the north array are identical to the impacts described for Alternative B. The south array is about 4.8 miles east of KOP 10. The impacts and the degree of contrast from the south array would be very similar to the north array. There would be a slightly great level of contrast under Alternative D than from Alternative B primarily because both arrays increase the overall scale of the project. The panels would appear distant, dark and muted horizontal bands that are somewhat indistinct from the surrounding landscape. Alternative D would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Hybrid: The impacts and the degree of contrast under the Hybrid Alternative would appear identical to Alternative B.

Cumulative: the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, currently under construction in the Primm Valley, consists of three solar arrays of mirrored panels; each array includes a central power tower. The Ivanpah project is located between KOP 10 and the Stateline project. The height of the solar panel, the bright, light-colored mirrored panel surfaces, and the tall height of the power towers topped with the bright white panel present strong contrasts of form line and color in the Primm Valley as seen from the KOP. The Ivanpah project would block views of most of the proposed Stateline project. The proposed Stateline project under any alternative would not contribute a noticeable, incremental impact to the valley landscape when considered cumulatively with the Ivanpah project as seen from the KOP.

---

#### Additional Mitigating Measures (See item 3)

There is no mitigation additional to the proposed mitigation included in Section 4.18.

---

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
VISUAL CONTRAST RATING WORKSHEET

Date: 4/18/12

District/ Field Office: California Desert District/  
Needles FO

Resource Area:

Activity (program): Renewable Energy Resources

## SECTION A. PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name Stateline Solar Farm	4. Location Township__17N__	5. Location Sketch
Key Observation Point #12 – 2.8 miles west of Primm	Range__14E__	
VRM Class VRI Class III	Section__11__	

## SECTION B. CHARACTERISTIC LANDSCAPE DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Flat, horizontal (foreground); Jagged, complex (background)	low, mounded shrubs; low, spiky cactus	Tall, vertical, internally complex lattice of T-line structures. ISEGS: tall, vertical towers, horizontal, large scale arrays.
LINE	Long, horizontal (foreground); straight, horizontal butt edge against base of mountains; Jagged, diagonal silhouette of background mountains, diagonal banding of strata	weak, discontinuous	straight, vertical tower perpendicular to ground; internal straight, diagonal, horizontal lines. ISEGS: narrow, vertical towers; straight edge of arrays
COLOR	light gray-tan to gold-tan (foreground); light to dark tans, grays, browns in mountain background.	Muted gray-greens, dark to medium greens, tan, brown.	rusty, dark brown to dark gray. ISEGS: red/white color banded towers; light, shiny panels.
TEXTURE	smooth (foreground): coarse, varied (background)	medium grain, medium density; random.	regular, ordered T-lines. ISEGS; fine panel surface; regular, orderly towers

## SECTION C. PROPOSED ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION

	1. LAND/WATER	2. VEGETATION	3. STRUCTURES
FORM	Land modifications not visible	modifications to vegetation not visible	horizontal, flat, rectangular planes of panels in middleground. Large scale in horizontal plane, low profile
LINE	not visible	not visible	straight edge contrasts with surrounding vegetation
COLOR	not visible	not visible	dark, muted tones recede into landscape
TEXTURE	not visible	not visible	fine surface

## SECTION D. CONTRAST RATING    \_\_SHORT TERM    \_\_LONG TERM

1.  DEGREE OF CONTRAST		FEATURES												2. Does project design meet visual resource management objectives? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_Yes    ___No (Explain on reverse side)	
		LAND/WATER BODY (1)				VEGETATION (2)				STRUCTURES (3)					
		STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE	STRONG	MODERATE	WEAK	NONE		
ELEMENTS	FORM		X				X				X			3. Additional mitigating measures recommended ___Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> _X_No    (Explain on reverse side)	
	LINE		X				X				X				
	COLOR		X				X				X				
	TEXTURE				X				X		X				
														Evaluator's Names Lisa Welch	Date 2/18/12

## SECTION D. (Continued)

Comments from item 2.

KOP Description

KOP 12 is on a transmission line access road 2.8 miles west of Primm. View is to the south, and includes a broad expanse of the Primm Valley with a mountainous backdrop to the southeast, south, and southwest. The rugged Clark Mountain Range provides a backdrop to KOP views. Valley. The Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System is currently under construction to the west and southwest of the KOP; the visual simulations depict the completed Ivanpah project.

Evaluation FactorsDistance: Relatively close (less than 1mile)Angle of View: Elevated above project, as compared to other KOPs.Duration: Viewer would be a hiker who would likely get a long-duration view.Relative Scale: Small compared to surrounding landscape and mountains.Season: Probably more viewers in spring, summer, and fall, and fewer in winter.Light Conditions: Does not affect viewsRecovery Time: Long-term due to slow recovery time for desert vegetation.Spatial Relationship: View in Alt. D covers a wider field of view than other alternatives.Atmospheric Condition: Does not affect views.Motion: Not applicable – no moving features in the landscape.Alternative-Specific Contrast Evaluation

Alternative B: The array would be within 0.40 miles of KOP 12. The panels would not face KOP 12. The panels would appear as a horizontal band extending across a wide field of view within in close proximity to the KOP. The supporting infrastructure and the shielded night-lighting would be visible due to the close proximity of the array. The overall level of change would be moderate, because the large scale of the array to the viewpoint would be lessened by the muted dark colors, which recede into the landscape; the low profile of the arrays appear to be almost flush with the ground surface; and because the dominant horizontal lines and form of the facility repeats the horizontal lines of the valley as seen from the KOP. The facility would be noticeable, but would not dominate the view. Alternative B would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape. The impacts to viewers at the KOP are larger under Alternative B than under Alternative D, because the facility is closer to the viewer, and would appear larger in scale.

Alternative D: The north solar array would be nearly 1 miles south of KOP 12; the south array would be screen by the north array.



---

The impacts and contrasts would be very similar to Alternative B; however, the overall degree of impact would be less because the facility and associated contrasts are reduced in scale relative to the landscape. Alternative D would meet the VRM Class III objective to partially retain the existing character of the landscape.

Hybrid: The impacts and the degree of contrast under the Hybrid Alternative would appear identical to Alternative B.

Cumulative: the Ivanpah Solar Electric Generating System, currently under construction in the Primm Valley, consists of three solar arrays of mirrored panels; each array includes a central power tower. The large arrays of solar panels, the bright, light-colored mirrored panel surfaces, and the tall height of the power towers topped with the bright white panel present strong contrasts of form line and color in the Primm Valley; however, the scale and color contrasts of the Ivanpah project would be minimized by the angle of view and the intervening Stateline project as seen from the KOP. The proposed Stateline project under any alternative contributes a noticeable, incremental impact to the valley landscape when considered cumulatively with the Ivanpah project.

---

#### Additional Mitigating Measures (See item 3)

There is no mitigation additional to the proposed mitigation included in Section 4.18.

---